



LAWRENCE  
LIVERMORE  
NATIONAL  
LABORATORY

# Evaluation of OGC Standards for Use in LLNL GIS

H. Walker, R. M. Chou, K. K. Chubb, J. L. Schek

July 12, 2006

Journal of Map and Geography Libraries

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor the University of California nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or the University of California, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

## **Evaluation of OGC Standards for Use in LLNL GIS**

**H. Walker, R. Chou, K. Chubb, J. Schek  
Computer Applications and Research Department  
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
Livermore, CA 94550**

Over the summer of 2005, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) Computer Applications and Research Department conducted a small project that examined whether Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) standards might be useful in meeting program mission requirements more effectively. OGC standards are intended to facilitate interoperability between geospatial processing systems to lower development costs and to avoid duplication of effort and vendor lock-in. Some OGC standards appear to be gaining traction in the geospatial data community, the Federal government, Department of Energy (DOE) and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and so an evaluation was deemed appropriate.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Geographic data are used by many programs at LLNL. Groups focused on Geographic Information Systems (GIS) exist in both the Energy & Environment Directorate and in the Engineering Directorate, with the Engineering team focusing on spatial analysis and the Energy & Environment providing general GIS capabilities. Many specific programs need geospatial information to meet their mission requirements. For example, the National Atmospheric Release Advisory Center (NARAC) provides an operational dispersion modeling service based on sophisticated atmospheric models. Geospatial data such as elevation data is an integral part of the model calculations, demographic data is used in effects calculations and a wide variety of geospatial data is used for base mapping. Many other scientific programs in the earth, environmental and

biological sciences use geospatial data in much of their work. Also many Homeland Security applications rely heavily on geospatial data. So effective means of acquiring, processing and presenting these data are of interest to the Laboratory and geospatial interoperability can potentially provide these means.

### ***Background***

While geographic data are used in a variety of applications, traditional implementations of geospatial processing capabilities have been associated with large expenses, including:

- production or identification of datasets
- transforming external data into forms that can be used locally
- acquiring and maintaining knowledge of complex GIS user interfaces
- development of application programs using packages with complex interfaces
- development of custom software to meet specific needs

The use of geospatial data has been limited by the expense of acquiring and maintaining the data and technology necessary to integrate geospatial processing into systems.

The issue of inefficiency in managing geographic data was identified as early as 1982 (see FGDC). For example, data sets are often redundant, having been previously produced by multiple organizations. Such redundancies can be attributed to the lack of knowledge of available data sets and the difficulty and expense transforming external data sets into usable forms. There are many organizations that play a role in attempting to improve the efficiency of geospatial data management. The Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) has promoted “the coordinated use, sharing and dissemination of

geospatial data” since 1990 (see FGDC). The efforts of the FGDC are focused on the creation of a National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI), which has four components:

1. *Metadata* – a standard for the description of data that allows potential consumers to evaluate the data.
2. *Clearinghouse* – a public collection of metadata that supports the discovery of potentially useful datasets.
3. *Standards* – technical specifications that allow systems to exchange geospatial information (see FGDC).
4. *Framework* – numerous standard datasets maintained by Federal agencies for public use, e.g., elevation and transportation.

The NSDI has been evolving since the early 1990s and is becoming a practical reality in the form of the Geospatial-One-Stop (see GOS).

While the NSDI contributes to effective geospatial data use, its efforts have not been sufficient to reach the vision of geospatial interoperability. Geospatial interoperability means that heterogeneous, independently-managed, distributed systems can interact effectively on the basis of requests for services and data based on mutually understood formats and conventions. The Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) is a consortium of commercial, government and university organizations with the goal of promoting geospatial interoperability (see OGC). While OGC has many efforts that support this goal, this paper focuses on standards development. OGC standards include conceptual models, data formats and interfaces that facilitate communication, interpretation and integration of data and services. Thus, OGC moves beyond FGDC by standardizing interfaces for communication between systems that exchange geospatial

data and processing. OGC also defines detailed implementation specifications that allow software developers to build applications in differing technologies that interoperate.

### ***Scope***

In approaching the issue of geospatial data standards and geospatial interoperability, the enormous number of relevant standards must be considered. The FGDC and OGC, as well as other organizations, have dozens of standards in various states of development. These standards are typically built on numerous other standards such as XML that are not specifically associated with geospatial data. OGC standards have been selected for this discussion because they are detailed enough to allow developers to build working implementations and are therefore likely candidates for integration into LLNL projects.

## **APPROACH**

### ***Selection of standards***

The full range of OGC standards is too large to consider in a project of limited scope (see OGC). Fortunately, the industry focus on OGC standards at this time involves a smaller subset. The two OGC standards gaining the most traction in the commercial and government sectors are the Web Mapping Service (WMS) and the Web Feature Service (WFS). Thus, these two standards are the focus here. However, these standards are not complete in and of themselves. They are built upon a number of other OGC and non-OGC standards. Building real WMS or WFS applications implies the use of the Stylized Layer Descriptor (SLD), Web Map Context Documents (WMC), Catalog Services Specification (CAT), Coordinate Transformation Services (CT), Simple Feature Specification (SFS), and Geographic Markup Language (GML) OGC standards. Also, the

OGC Sensor Model Language (SML) and Observations and Measurements (O&M) standards could have near-term applicability to LLNL programs. These standards are built on standards such as XML and GeoTIFF but these non-OGC standards will be mentioned only in passing. See Figure 1 for a representation of how these standards are related.

### ***Evaluation of standards***

Each standard was read by one or more participants in the project, with a few of the most central standards being reviewed by most or all of the participants. Participants were established developers supporting a cross section of sponsors and domain applications. The standards were discussed to clarify the relationships between the standards and the difficulty of implementation or integration into current or future projects. In addition, the integration of OGC capabilities into the Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) GIS was evaluated as an indicator of commercial acceptance. The applicability of these standards to LLNL programs was evaluated.

## **RESULTS**

A very brief description of the standards considered is presented below. Note that each of these is defined by a substantial document and the standards are often supplemented by other documents that can provide guidance into the details of building applications.

### ***Summary of standards***

**WMS** (Web Map Service) allows clients to receive descriptions of layers, coordinate reference systems (CRS), output formats and display styles supported by the service. Clients can request available layers in supported CRS, display styles and output formats. WMS implementations usually provide image data (e.g., JPEG) to be displayed at the client's system.

**WFS** (Web Feature Service) allows clients to receive descriptions of layers, feature types, and CRS supported by the service. Clients can request available features in supported CRS. The output of a request is normally in GML.

**GML** (Geography Markup Language) supports a rich means of describing geographic features. It covers both 2- and 3-dimensional features. It supports the description of CRS, observations, units and temporal coordinate systems.

**CAT2** (Catalogue Service) supports service registration, description and discovery.

**CT** (Coordinate Transformation Service) allows locations, CRS and transformations to be described, implemented and combined.

**SFS** (Simple Features Specification) provides interfaces and structures that allow geographic features to be expressed in SQL, COM and CORBA.

**SLD** (Stylized Layer Descriptor) controls of the symbolization features in a layer.

**WMC** (Web Map Context) manages of collections of multiple maps.

**SML** (Sensor Modeling Language) provides sensor information in support of data discovery, the processing and analysis of the sensor measurements, the geolocation of observed values, and archival of fundamental properties and assumptions about a sensor. SensorML is a part of the OGC's Sensor Web Enablement (SWE) activity, which establishes interfaces and protocols to enable applications to access sensors of all types.

**O&M** (Observations and Measurements) captures data about some phenomenon, binds observation, spatial, and temporal data together and provides a common data format to record any type of data. O&M is a part of the SWE activity.

### ***Commercial Support for OGC Standards***

One way to evaluate the acceptance and practical value of geospatial standards is to examine the support they receive from commercial GIS vendors. While a full evaluation



of the commercial sector would be a significant project in itself, a far narrower, but useful, perspective can be gained by evaluating the support ESRI is providing. While a single vendor certainly limits the scope of any conclusions, the fact that ESRI provides 80-90% of Federal government GIS implementations indicates that such conclusions are of practical value.

ESRI currently supports a subset of OGC standards via desktop extensions, and server connectors and extensions. ESRI currently supports GML 2.1.2 in ArcGIS 9.1 via extensions and will support GML 3 in ArcGIS 9.2. ESRI is also taking a lead role in evolving the GML standard. In particular, they are pushing the development of a simpler GML standard (SF-GML) for 2-dimensional geospatial data. ESRI is improving existing support of WMS and WFS and adding new standards in their ArcGIS 9.2 release. ESRI currently supports WFS 1.0 but considers the 1.1 standard to be in flux and is delaying server-side support. More details are available at the ESRI web site (see ESRI). ESRI is showing significant commitment to the OGC standards considered in this paper.

### ***Evaluation of OGC Standards for the GEn&SIS Project***

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Geographical, Environmental, & Siting Information System (GEn&SIS) project is a web-based GIS that supports data reconnaissance for nuclear reactor site licensing and license renewal using public data. The graphics and supporting data are used to support decisions in the Environmental Impact Statements and justify those decisions in public hearings. The main goal of the project is to take the raw data and present it in a final form, with all intermediate steps being transparent to the user. These intermediate steps include substantial post-processing and statistical calculations. Although the client base includes a number of users very

familiar with GIS, their interest is in the generated maps and supporting data. The system was originally to be made available to the public, however, aggregate data sensitivity issues led to restricting the user base.

The original implementation used X-Windows with a web interface for specifying input parameters. It became increasingly cumbersome and expensive to maintain a custom GIS and the project moved to an ESRI ArcIMS implementation. The selection ArcIMS was driven by common use of ESRI products at LLNL and in government.

Given the project's status, the implementation of a data distribution format such as GML would not provide a clear benefit for the current customer base. However, if these data were to be made valuable to the public, an effective way to make the data (not an image of the data) available would be using GML. Lacking support for complex spatial queries against feature sets, the WFS could not directly replace the current system. A WMS could contribute to this application by supporting data display; however, the WMS would not allow access to the underlying, processed data or the metadata. GML could be used for metadata and processed data distribution, but this would require a substantial reengineering of the current system, which is inconsistent with the current goals and funding. In summary, there are advantages to avoiding the vendor lock-in associated with using ESRI propriety protocols and data formats. However, until ESRI more fully integrates OGC support into ArcIMS, there does not appear to be a cost-effective way to migrate this project to an OGC standards-based implementation.

### ***Evaluation of OGC Standards for the NARAC Program***

The National Atmospheric Release Advisory Center (NARAC) provides tools and services that map the spread of hazardous material released into the atmosphere. NARAC

is a national support and resource center for planning, preparedness, real-time emergency response, and detailed assessments of threats or incidents involving a wide variety of hazards, including nuclear, radiological, chemical, biological or natural emissions.

NARAC products provide information on affected areas, potential casualties, health effects, and recommended protective actions. NARAC is a distributed system providing modeling tools for deployment to an end user's computer system as well as real-time access to quality-assured, advanced model predictions from the national center.

There are numerous ways in which NARAC could utilize of OGC standards:

1. *Product generation* – NARAC currently interoperates with GIS by creating ESRI shape file representations of dispersion. GIS interoperability could be improved with a GML representation of NARAC products. A NARAC GML product would only require limited portions of GML and could be implemented cost-effectively.
2. *WMS/WFS client* – Extending NARAC mapping and visualization capabilities to allow the selection and import of map layers from external WMS could be added to the system without difficulty. A WFS capability would require GML support.
3. *NARAC WMS/WFS service* – Processing the WMS protocol does not raise difficulties and NARAC already produces dispersion pattern images in supported formats and so a core WMS capability would not be difficult to implement.

However, creating a product discovery mechanism from the applicable standards would require a significant design effort, as would the integration of a security model. A WFS implementation would also involve the creation of GML products.

In summary, delivering GML products and developing a WMS client capability seem to be valuable and inexpensive enough to be given near-term consideration. Other applications of OGC services involve larger efforts and will wait for sponsor requests.

### ***Evaluation of OGC SensorML and O&M for LLNL Programs***

Many lab projects could benefit from the use of SensorML and O&M for data interoperability but few projects have an immediate need to implement them. In the long term, all projects producing or archiving sensor data should be aware of these models to facilitate data interoperability and long-term data archival. Areas that could potentially benefit from SensorML and O&M include NARAC (meteorological and sampler data), radiation detection (long-term or baseline measurements and configuration data), geology (seismic data for natural and artificial events), biology (time-based air samples and automated test results) and ARGUS (motion detection, “alarm” conditions). Future projects should consider implementing SensorML for sharing and storing sensor metadata. SensorML would increase interoperability between projects by providing a standardized method of expressing sensor differences so that supporting software could transform data to consistent representation. Future projects should also consider using as O&M as a data format for storing and transferring data. O&M could be used to replace existing data formats to facilitate long-term storage of the data. Other projects may benefit from using O&M for data interoperability to minimize problems of cross-platform use and to clarify the meaning of the data. However, O&M is currently a proposal and is unsupported commercially. O&M and SWE are standards that bear watching but are not mature enough to drive current efforts at LLNL.

## **SUMMARY**

OGC standards are having growing impact on the GIS community and it is important to be aware of their development. On the hand, many of the standards and standard groupings are immature and evolving rapidly. Consequently, LLNL developers should generally take a measured approach by identifying specific applications where focused use of specific OGC standards can provide cost-effective solutions. General application of OGC standards should wait for the standards and the implementations of these standards to mature. It is important to note that OGC standards reflect common denominator capabilities and so performance may suffer relative to proprietary solutions.

The overriding issues of geospatial data sharing and interoperability are being addressed on several fronts and important progress is being made. However, the promise of a true National Spatial Data Infrastructure is short of fruition. Continued evolution of standards and implementations is required. As enabling technologies that support this infrastructure mature, it is also important that institutional and political barriers to data sharing be resolved so that the effective use can be made of these emerging capabilities.

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by University of California, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract W-7405-Eng-48.




Figure 1. Relationships between key OGC standards.

## REFERENCES

- FGDC, “The Federal Geographic Data Committee: Historical Reflections – Future Directions”, Federal Geographic Data Committee,  
[http://fgdc.er.usgs.gov/publications/fgdc\\_history.html](http://fgdc.er.usgs.gov/publications/fgdc_history.html).
- FGDC, “Federal Geographic Data Committee Home Page”, Federal Geographic Data Committee, <http://fgdc.er.usgs.gov/index.html>.
- FGDC, “Status of FGDC Standards” Federal Geographic Data Committee,  
<http://fgdc.er.usgs.gov/standards/status/textstatus.html>.
- GOS, “Your One Stop for Federal, State & Local Geographic Data”, Geospatial One-Stop, <http://www.geo-one-stop.gov/>.
- OGC, “Welcome to OGC”, Open Geospatial Consortium,  
<http://www.opengeospatial.org/>.
- OGC, “Adopted Document Baseline”, Open Geospatial Consortium,  
<http://www.opengeospatial.org/specs/?page=baseline>
- ESRI, “Interoperability and Standards: OGC Support”, Environmental Systems Research Institute, <http://www.esri.com/software/standards/ogc-support.html>